



MANIFESTATIONS OF COMMUNICATIVE REALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Yokubova Mavluda Iskandarovna

E-mail: mavlyudayakubov0@gmail.com

Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, National University
of Uzbekistan, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences

Abstract: *This article explores the manifestation of communicative reality within the context of social knowledge, the emergence of the concept of communicative reality in modern social thought through classical ontological and epistemological paradigms, and its intrinsic connection with the problems of values, historical memory, national identity, and social development in Uzbek philosophical thought. It also examines how the manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge is directly linked to the stages of socio-cultural development of human thinking.*

Keywords: *Communicative reality in the context of social knowledge, social communication, manifestation of knowledge, stages of socio-cultural development of human thought, theory of communicative action, socio-cultural processes, social consciousness, human thought, the complex interrelationship between language and social experience, semiotic space.*

In the context of social knowledge, the manifestation of communicative reality finds its expression in the complex synthesis of human thought, social interaction, and cultural discourse. This is because social knowledge is formed not merely as a collection of objective data, but in the process of creating, explaining, and interpreting meaning. In this process, communicative reality defines the very form of knowledge's existence.

The influence of digital communicative reality on the social sciences is that it adapts human thought to new epistemological criteria. In place of stable



forms of knowledge, a prevalence of rapid, interactive, and networked models of cognition is emerging. Therefore, from a philosophical and methodological perspective, the task of social knowledge is not to let human thought be lost within algorithmic processes, but rather to strengthen the communicative, reflexive, and spiritual potential of human consciousness.

In modern social thought, the concept of communicative reality prompts a re-evaluation of classical ontological and epistemological paradigms. Within the framework of an activity-oriented, interactive approach, reality is not presented as a pre-existing objective structure within consciousness, but rather as an intersubjective space formed through the process of verbal and practical interaction. In this sense, communicative reality is a socio-spiritual existence constructed through the exchange of meanings, debate, interpretation, and consensus. M. Bakhtin writes, "the phenomenon of speech is always an encounter of two consciousnesses¹." He emphasizes that meaning is not born within a single subject but exists in the form of an address awaiting a response. This idea reveals the dialogic essence of communicative reality; any meaning lives in its relationship with another consciousness. However, in Bakhtin's conception, the normative foundations of dialogue are not clearly systematized; dialogue is presented as an ontological fact, but its rational criteria are not rigorously developed. Therefore, Bakhtin's views illuminate the anthropological underpinnings of communicative reality. This approach demonstrates the dialogic, rather than monologic, nature of communicative reality, implying that it also forms as a polyphonic, multifaceted process within social knowledge.

In Uzbek philosophical thought, the manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge is examined in close connection with the problems of values, historical memory, national identity, and social development. In this regard, Q. Nazarov, in his article "Scientific and

¹ Bakhtin M.M. Genres of Speech and Other Evening Articles. Moscow: Iskustvo, 1979. - 424 p.



Methodological Issues in the Study of Uzbek Philosophy," states: "Uzbek philosophy is a form of ethnic worldview, originating from the depths of millennia and formed alongside our people, who possess a long cultural history²." This idea indicates that the formation of social knowledge occurs within the framework of communicative reality - that is, on the basis of historical experience, cultural heritage, and social discourse. Here, reality is not a product of subjective consciousness but manifests as an intersubjective field constituted through the process of intergenerational continuity and spiritual exchange.

"The system of values faces the necessity of renewal during periods of fundamental shifts in societal development³." This observation expresses the dynamic nature of communicative reality. In the arena of social discourse, values are reinterpreted, reassessed, and updated in accordance with historical conditions.

The concept of communicative reality signifies an ontological-axiological form of social being wherein meaning, value, and knowledge are constituted intersubjectively not within the confines of individual consciousness, but through the process of verbal and practical interaction. Such a reality manifests not as a pre-existing, external, and objective being, but as a socio-spiritual space that people create and continually reconstruct through communication, interpretation, debate, and consensus. Thus, communicative reality is a socially mediated field of meaning, formed through signs, discourses, and practical activities, whose content is always determined through the process of interpretation and recognition. Its primary ontological characteristic is that it emerges from intersubjective relationships and requires constant engagement with another consciousness for its existence. From an epistemological standpoint, it interprets knowledge not as a passive reflection

² Nazarov, Q. "Scientific and Methodological Issues of Studying Uzbek Philosophy." *Falsafa va Huquq*, no. 3, 2024, pp. 10-12.

³ Nazarov, Q. (2011). Axiology (The philosophy of values) . Akademiya, p. 3.



of an object, but as an intersubjective outcome achieved through argumentative justification and general recognition.

Communicative reality is the discursive manifestation of social being, formed as a field of intersubjective meaning. It constitutes the ontological, epistemological, and ethical foundations of social thought and theoretically substantiates a model of social relations based on freedom, responsibility, and mutual understanding in modern society.

The manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge is directly linked to the stages of socio-cultural development of human thought, the analysis of which necessitates methodological renewal in scientific thinking. Communicative reality, first and foremost, shapes knowledge, values, and spiritual experience in society through the interplay of language, communication, and social consciousness. As Habermas emphasizes, "the theory of communicative action ensures the stability of society not only through economic or political mechanisms but also through the intersubjective sphere of communication⁴." According to this idea, communicative reality in social knowledge is not merely a reflection of reality but a process of its reconstruction. This is because human thought forms every spiritual value through communication, and this process becomes a constructive force in social life. Therefore, reality in communication does not exist on its own but is created through intersubjective agreement and debate.

H. Arendt approaches this issue from a political-philosophical perspective, asserting that "human existence acquires meaning in the social sphere through speech and action⁵." This view is interpreted as another facet of understanding communicative reality within the context of social knowledge. This is because the manifestation of knowledge is not formed within the framework of individual consciousness, but rather in the social environment as

⁴ Habermas J. The Theory of Communicative Action. – Boston: Beacon Press, 1984. – P. 92

⁵ Arendt H. The Human Condition. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, – P. 176.



an objective force through speech and practice. From a scholarly standpoint, Arendt's position allows for an understanding of the mechanism by which communicative reality is "actualized through action" within social knowledge.

In this regard, it can be argued that while the approaches of Habermas and H. Arendt present the communicative process as the fundamental basis of social knowledge, they do not sufficiently account for the power relations, ideological pressures, and political manipulations present in the real social environment. For example, Foucault contends that "discourse is a mechanism that produces and legitimizes power⁶." According to this view, communicative reality is not always based on freedom and is often constrained by political and ideological structures.

When analyzing the manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge, it is first necessary to recognize this concept's dependence on cultural and spiritual processes. Communicative reality is formed as a common ground for people's daily communication, their understanding of cultural texts, and the exchange of social experience. Therefore, Gadamer emphasizes that "hermeneutic experience includes not only the text, but also the dialogue that enables understanding⁷." Consequently, in social knowledge, the process of perceiving reality occurs not in isolation from communication, but through it. This allows for the interpretation of communicative reality as an integral part of the hermeneutic process.

The thought of the philosopher Derrida is of particular importance in this matter; according to him, "the meaning of a text is never final; it is constantly in a process of *différance*." According to this approach, communicative reality is a phenomenon in constant motion - open and perpetually reconstructed in various contexts. This approach bases social

⁶ Foucault M. *L'ordre du discours*. – Paris: Gallimard, 1971. – P. 59

⁷ Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and Method*. – New York: Seabury Press, 1985. – P. 302



knowledge not on rigid objectivity, but on multi-layered meanings and the dialogue between different interpretations.

From a scholarly perspective, while the ideas of Gadamer and Ricoeur illuminate the hermeneutic and dialogic nature of communicative reality, Derrida warns of the openness and infinitude of this process, and the temporality of any agreement. Such an approach allows communicative reality in social knowledge to be understood as a process that ensures the spiritual development of society through constant perception, reinterpretation, and discussion. Therefore, the manifestation of communicative reality and rationality in social knowledge serves as a basis for the continuous reprocessing of humanity's cultural and logical heritage.

The manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge is linked to understanding the deep layers of socio-cultural processes. In this process, communication is seen not merely as an exchange of information, but as a fundamental mechanism for shaping social consciousness and cultural experience. As Lyotard argues, "in the modern era, the legitimacy of knowledge is based not on grand narratives, but on a multitude of language games and local forms of communication⁸." Consequently, communicative reality is not a single, rigid system, but a fragmented field of social discourse formed in various contexts. This idea encourages viewing communicative rationality not as an absolute normative principle, but as a multifaceted, contextual, and pluralistic phenomenon.

Furthermore, Baudrillard's theory offers a critical illumination of the modern stage of communicative reality. In his view, "in postmodern society, communication often produces not truth, but simulacra, with the result that the boundaries between reality and representation disappear⁹." From this

⁸ Lyotard J.-F. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. – Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. – P. 37

⁹ Baudrillard J. *Simulacra and Simulation*. – Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1981. – P. 11



standpoint, communicative reality is always a product of social construction, in which rationality itself can be subject to manipulation.

Scholarly analysis shows that while Lyotard's idea of local communication allows for the interpretation of communicative reality as a fragmented and polycentric process, Arendt's views on freedom and responsibility illuminate the socio-cultural essence of rationality. Baudrillard, on the other hand, reveals the simulative nature of communicative processes in postmodern conditions and draws attention to the vulnerabilities of communicative rationality. Therefore, in the context of social knowledge, the manifestation of communicative reality and rationality must be evaluated as a complex, multifaceted, and dynamic process inseparable from the spirit of the age.

Additionally, Lotman's views on semiotic space also shed light on this issue. He writes, "culture is not a system of individual signs, but a collection of various semiotic systems in constant dialogue¹⁰." Based on this idea, it can be said that communicative reality is formed by the intersection of various signs, codes, and discourses in social knowledge. In a critical analysis of Lotman's theory, its strength lies in revealing culture as a dynamic system, while its weakness is that it does not sufficiently illuminate the extent to which semiotic processes depend on socio-political contexts.

In analyzing the manifestation of communicative reality within the context of social knowledge, the epistemological and axiological dimensions of communication hold a special place. From this perspective, as Taylor notes, "understanding human existence is possible only through language, since language is the sole medium for expressing experience and meaning¹¹." This view presents communicative reality not just as a mechanism for information

¹⁰ Lotman Y. Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture. – London: I.B. Tauris, 1990. – P. 125

¹¹ Taylor Ch. Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers I. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. – P. 36



transmission, but as a fundamental form of human existence. However, Taylor does not adequately explain how language is constrained in socio-political contexts, which is why it is appropriate to enrich this approach with Foucault's theory of discourse.

Luhmann's system theory also presents an important scholarly viewpoint. He notes that "communication is the main self-reproducing element of social systems¹²." Based on this idea, it can be said that communicative reality acts as society's self-organizing mechanism. At the same time, Luhmann's approach focuses more on the structural aspect, but offers a limited explanation of the axiological and cultural aspects of communication.

The analysis of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge requires a deeper exploration of the socio-cultural foundations of human experience. In this process, language, communication, and the creation of meaning serve as the primary tools. Cassirer, interpreting culture as "the process of humanity's self-creation through symbolic forms," notes that "due to symbolic activity, which is inextricably linked with human nature, man lives not only as a biological being but also as a meaning-producing being¹³." This approach demonstrates that communicative reality is formed through symbolic processes. At this juncture, a scholarly critique can be offered: while Cassirer's concept explains culture on the basis of symbols, it does not sufficiently address the role of power, social inequality, and conflicts in the process of communication.

Furthermore, Dewey, interpreting experience and communication as key elements of the cognitive process, asserts that "innovations in education, politics, and culture depend on the ways people communicate with one another¹⁴." This idea reveals the practical significance of communicative reality in the life of society, as rationality finds its expression not only in theoretical

¹² Luhmann N. Social Systems. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. – P. 139

¹³ Cassirer E. An Essay on Man. – New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994. – P. 45

¹⁴ Dewey J. The Public and Its Problems. – New York: Holt, – P. 151



but also in practical-cultural activity. The strength of Dewey's approach is its pragmatic character, but its weakness is that it does not sufficiently account for the influence of global and transnational factors in the communication process.

The manifestation of communicative reality in the context of social knowledge is a complex socio-cultural balance that occurs within the language-sign-power triangle, where reality is "created" in semiotic networks. Peirce defines the sign relation as "something which stands for something else and creates an interpretant," and indicates the continuity of the process of semiosis. In his words, "a sign is never confined to a single meaning; it expands through a chain of interpretants¹⁵." This approach compels us to interpret communicative reality not as a deterministic process, but as an open and reinterpretable one.

In conclusion, for the social sciences, communicative reality is a construct built between signs, codes, and actants, often naturalized through "myth" and hierarchized by social capital.

In the context of social knowledge, the manifestation of communicative reality is interpreted as a complex socio-philosophical process. This is because the concept illuminates the dynamics of human cognitive activity, forms of communication, and social consciousness. J. Habermas, in his "Theory of Communicative Action," states that "rational communication is based on the ability of each subject to justify their opinion, defend it with evidence, and critically evaluate the claims of others¹⁶." This idea reveals the essence of communicative reality: communication is not merely an exchange of language, but a means of collectively constructing social reality.

This issue is also important in the context of Uzbekistan's social sciences, because if the communicative foundations of knowledge are weak, both rationality and social trust are diminished.

¹⁵ Peirce C. S. The Essential Peirce, Vol. 2. - Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998. - P. 410

¹⁶ Habermas J. The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984. - P. 285



In the context of the social sciences, the manifestation of communicative reality holds a special place in understanding the substantive foundations of human thought and applying them to social practice. This is because the social sciences analyze the spiritual, cultural, and moral layers of human activity, and in this process, a need arises to comprehend the social reality formed through communicative discourse and the rational norms associated with it. From this perspective, K.-O. Apel, in his communicative philosophy, states that "universal pragmatics strives to define the conditions of communication through which each participant can justify their opinion and achieve mutual understanding with others¹⁷." This idea demonstrates the normative nature of communicative reality; it is not simple communication, but a search for truth by participants in a dialogue through equally valid, reasoned arguments. In the social context of Uzbekistan, this viewpoint means that developing communicative reality requires a culture of open, reasoned, and debate-ready discourse within the educational and scientific environment.

In his theory of social systems, N. Luhmann asserts that "communication is the self-organizing mechanism of social systems, through which the system reproduces itself¹⁸." Responding to this view, in the social sciences, communicative reality not only reinforces existing social knowledge but also serves the process of creating new knowledge and updating rational criteria. If communication is focused solely on repetition and standardization, the renewal of rationality will slow down. Therefore, Luhmann's approach implies the necessity of a communicative reality that ensures creativity and innovation in the social sciences.

In conclusion, social knowledge - a system of cognition related to a person's spiritual, cultural, historical, social, and communicative existence - is moving away from its classical structure in the digital communicative space

¹⁷ Apel K.-O. Towards a Transformation of Philosophy. London: Routledge, 1990. – P. 16

¹⁸ Luhmann N. Social Systems. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. – P. 142



and is being reshaped based on new communicative paradigms. Ontologically, communicative reality becomes a techno-virtual form of existence; epistemologically, it becomes a networked, self-referential model of knowledge; and logically, it becomes a system of algorithmic rationality. This transformation does not eliminate human communication but continues it in a new existential form, where human existence expresses itself not through the "word," but through the "code." Here, "communicative reality" emerges as a new ontological field of interaction between humans and technology.

Thus, in the social sciences, communicative reality possesses a universal pragmatic basis, as emphasized by Apel, and functions as a mechanism for systemic self-organization, as pointed out by Luhmann. These approaches serve as a crucial theoretical and practical foundation for the effective organization of communicative processes within the scientific and educational spheres of Uzbekistan.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1979). *Genres of Speech and Other Late Essays*. Moscow: Iskustvo.
2. Nazarov, Q. (2024). Scientific and methodological issues of studying Uzbek philosophy. *Falsafa va Huquq*, (3), 10–12.
3. Nazarov, Q. (2011). *Axiology (The Philosophy of Values)*. Tashkent: Akademiya.
4. Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon Press.
5. Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
7. Gadamer, H.-G. (1985). *Truth and Method*. New York: Seabury Press.
8. Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.



9. Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and Simulation*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
10. Lotman, Y. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: I.B. Tauris.
11. Taylor, Ch. (1985). *Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
13. Cassirer, E. (1994). *An Essay on Man*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
14. Dewey, J. (1927). *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Holt.
15. Peirce, C. S. (1998). *The Essential Peirce*, Vol. 2. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
16. Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press.
17. Apel, K.-O. (1990). *Towards a Transformation of Philosophy*. London: Routledge.
18. Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.